

1 XAVIER BECERRA  
2 Attorney General of California  
3 SARAH E. MORRISON  
4 ERIC KATZ  
5 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
CATHERINE M. WIEMAN, SBN 222384  
TATIANA K. GAUR, SBN 246227  
ROXANNE J. CARTER, SBN 259441  
JESSICA BARCLAY-STROBEL, SBN 280361  
BRYANT B. CANNON, SBN 284496  
Deputy Attorneys General  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Telephone: (213) 269-6329  
Fax: (916) 731-2128  
E-mail: Tatiana.Gaur@doj.ca.gov  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California, by and through Attorney General Xavier Becerra and California State Water Resources Control Board*

11 [Additional parties and counsel listed on signature pages]

LETITIA JAMES  
Attorney General of the State of New York  
PHILIP BEIN (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Senior Counsel  
TIMOTHY HOFFMAN (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Senior Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Bureau  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (716) 853-8465  
Fax: (716) 853-8579  
Email: Timothy.Hoffman@ag.ny.gov  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New York*

12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 ANDREW WHEELER, et al.,

19 Defendants,

20 STATE OF GEORGIA, et al.,

21 Intervenor-Defendants.

22  
**Case No. 3:20-cv-03005-RS**

23  
**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Date: September 17, 2020  
Time: 10:00 am  
Courtroom: Courtroom 3 – 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco Courthouse  
Judge: The Honorable Richard Seeborg  
Action Filed: May 1, 2020

23  
The parties to the above-entitled action submit this Joint Case Management Statement  
24 pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California-Contents of  
25 Joint Case Management Statement (Standing Order), Judge Seeborg's Standing Order re: Initial  
26 Case Management, and Civil Local Rules 16-5 (Procedure in Actions for Review on an  
27 Administrative Record) and 16-9 (Case Management Statement and Proposed Order).  
28

1 Undersigned counsel for Plaintiffs<sup>1</sup>, Defendants<sup>2</sup>, and State Intervenor-Defendants<sup>3</sup> (together, the  
 2 Parties), after having discussed the items enumerated in the Standing Order and applicable local  
 3 rules, respectfully submit the following joint statement:

4       1. Jurisdiction and Service

5 All parties to this action have been served.

6 Plaintiffs contend that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (action  
 7 arising under the laws of the United States) and 5 U.S.C. § 702 (judicial review of agency action  
 8 under the Administrative Procedure Act).

9 Defendants reserve the right to challenge subject-matter jurisdiction to the extent Plaintiffs  
 10 fail to meet their burden of establishing their Article III standing at the summary judgment stage.

11       2. Facts:

12 On April 21, 2020, Defendants promulgated “The Navigable Waters Protection Rule:  
 13 Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’” (2020 Rule or Rule), which delineates the waters that  
 14 are protected by the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.* (CWA or Act). 85 Fed. Reg.  
 15 22,250 (Apr. 21, 2020). The 2020 Rule replaced the “Definition of ‘Waters of the United  
 16 States’—Recodification of Pre-Existing Rules,” 84 Fed. Reg. 56,626 (Oct. 22, 2019) (2019 Rule).  
 17 According to Plaintiffs, the 2020 Rule narrows the definition of “waters of the United States,”  
 18 categorically excludes many ephemeral streams and wetlands from the definition’s scope, and  
 19 eliminates interstate waters as a category of waters protected by the Act.

20 On May 1, 2020, Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit, seeking judicial review of the 2020 Rule under  
 21 the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 551 *et seq.* (APA).

---

22       1 Plaintiffs are the States of California, New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Maryland,  
 23 Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont,  
 24 Washington and Wisconsin, the Commonwealths of Massachusetts and Virginia, the North  
 25 Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, the District of Columbia, and the City of New  
 26 York.

27       2 Defendants are the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EPA  
 28 Administrator Andrew Wheeler, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps), and  
 Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works R.D. James.

28       3 State Intervenor-Defendants are the States of Georgia, West Virginia, Alabama, Alaska,  
 Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana,  
 Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas,  
 Utah, and Wyoming.

1           On June 2, 2020, Defendants filed a certified administrative record index for the 2020 Rule.  
 2 ECF No. 115-2.

3           On June 10, 2020, the Court granted State Intervenor-Defendants' motion to intervene and  
 4 deemed their answer to the complaint filed on the same date. ECF No. 160.

5           Defendants filed their answer to the complaint on August 10, 2020.

6           On August 31, 2020, Defendants filed an amended certified administrative record index for  
 7 the 2020 Rule. ECF No. 206-2.

8           3. Legal Issues

9           Plaintiffs allege that the 2020 Rule is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, and  
 10 not in accordance with law in violation of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), and must be vacated  
 11 and set aside.

12           Defendants and State Intervenor-Defendants dispute these claims.

13           4. Motions

14           A. Prior Motions

- 15           • Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction or Stay: This motion was filed on  
 16 May 18, 2020. ECF No. 30. The Court heard oral argument on June 18, 2020 and  
 17 denied the motion on June 19, 2020. ECF No. 171.<sup>4</sup>
- 18           • Sacketts' Motion to Intervene: This motion was filed on May 21, 2020. ECF No.  
 19 45. The Court ruled that the motion would be resolved without oral argument  
 20 under Civil Local Rule 7-1(b). ECF No. 80. The motion was denied on August 13,

---

21           <sup>4</sup> In addition, the following motions pertaining to Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary  
 22 Injunction or Stay have been filed: Plaintiffs' Motion for Order Shortening Time, ECF No. 32,  
 23 which was granted (ECF No. 33); Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration, Opposition to  
 24 Plaintiffs' Motion for Order Shortening Time, and Cross-motion for Order for Enlargement of  
 25 Time, ECF No. 34, which was denied (ECF Nos. 37 and 64); the Institute for Policy Integrity's  
 26 Motion for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary  
 27 Injunction or Stay, ECF No. 55, which was granted (ECF No. 80); American Fisheries Society, et  
 28 al.'s Motion for Leave to File Amici Curiae Brief in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for a  
 Preliminary Injunction or Stay, ECF No. 68, which was granted (ECF No. 80); Duarte Nursery  
 Inc.'s Motion for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief in opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for a  
 Preliminary Injunction or Stay, ECF No. 105 (the Court has not ruled on this motion); Freeport-  
 McMoran, Inc.'s Motion to File a Brief as Amicus Curiae in opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for a  
 Preliminary Injunction or Stay, ECF No. 129 (the Court has not ruled on this motion); and the  
 Sacketts' Motion for Order Shortening Time, ECF No. 78, which was denied (ECF No. 80).

2020, ECF No. 200, but the Court has allowed the Sacketts to file an Amicus Curiae Brief. *Id.* The Sacketts have since filed a notice of appeal challenging the order denying their motion to intervene. ECF No. 201.

- Proposed Business Intervenors’ Motion to Intervene: This motion was filed on May 21, 2020. ECF No. 43. The Court ruled that this motion also would be resolved without oral argument. ECF No. 80. The motion was denied on August 13, 2020, ECF No. 200, but the Court has allowed the Proposed Business Intervenors to file an Amicus Curiae Brief. *Id.*
- State Intervenor-Defendants’ Motion to Intervene: This motion was filed on June 1, 2020. ECF No. 107. The Court granted the motion on June 10, 2020. ECF No. 160.<sup>5</sup>

B. Motion to Complete/Supplement the Administrative Record

The certified administrative record index filed by Defendants on June 2, 2020 (ECF No. 115-2) (AR Index) and the amended certified administrative record index filed on August 31, 2020 (ECF No. 206-2) (Amended AR Index) include hyperlinks to access the documents in the record contained on the docket for the 2020 Rule (Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OW-2018-0149) regulations.gov. However, neither the AR Index nor the Amended AR Index provides access to all documents in the record. In late July 2020, Plaintiffs informed Defendants that they are unable to access all documents in the administrative record and requested electronic access to all documents in the administrative record. Defendants did not provide electronic access to or otherwise produce these documents but on September 8, 2020, Defendants provided a list of documents that are not accessible on the docket for the 2020 Rule at regulations.gov, and therefore cannot be electronically accessed by Plaintiffs. According to Defendants, these documents include roughly 230 documents that may be copyrighted material as well as physical files in a file size/format that is not accessible on the docket. Defendants have stated they can provide these documents to Plaintiffs and Intervenor Defendants only if the Parties enter into a

<sup>5</sup> State Defendant-Intervenors also filed a Motion to Expedite Review of Motion to Intervene, ECF No. 143, which was granted (ECF No. 146).

1 protective order governing the use of such documents. The Parties will endeavor to reach an  
2 agreement on a protective order related to the production of the copyrighted materials pursuant to  
3 the schedule outlined in paragraph 17 below. If the Parties fail to reach such an agreement by the  
4 deadlines in paragraph 17, Plaintiffs will likely file a motion to complete/supplement the  
5 administrative record.

6       If the Parties are unable to agree on the terms of a protective order allowing for the  
7 production of the documents that Defendants assert are copyrighted, the Parties will meet and  
8 confer regarding a motion to complete/supplement the administrative record and will provide the  
9 Court with a proposed briefing schedule for that motion by September 29, 2020.

10       C. Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment

11       The Parties anticipate resolving this matter through cross-motions for summary judgment.  
12 The Parties' proposed briefing schedule for the cross-motions is provided in paragraph 17, below.

13       5. Amendment of Pleadings

14       No amendments are anticipated by any party.

15       6. Evidence Preservation

16       The Parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically  
17 Stored Information (ESI Guidelines). Plaintiffs do not anticipate that any issues will arise  
18 regarding the preservation of evidence but have requested that Defendants take reasonable and  
19 proportionate steps to preserve potential evidence relevant to the issues in this action.

20       7. Disclosures

21       The Parties agree that initial disclosures are not required (or necessary) under Fed. R. Civ.  
22 P. 26(a)(1)(B)(i).

23       8. Discovery

24       The Parties do not anticipate discovery.

25       9. Class Actions

26       This case is not a class action.

27       10. Related Cases

1       There are challenges to the 2020 Rule pending in other district courts: *Colorado v. EPA*,  
 2 Case No. 20-cv-01461 (D. Colo.); *Pascua Yaqui Tribe v. EPA*, No. 4:20-cv-00266 (D. Ariz.);  
 3 *Chesapeake Bay Found., Inc. v. EPA*, No. 1:20-cv-01064 (D. Md.); *Conservation Law Found. v.*  
 4 *EPA*, No. 1:20-cv-010820 (D. Mass.); *S.C. Coastal Conservation League v. Wheeler*, No. 2:20-  
 5 cv-01687 (D.S.C.); *Navajo Nation v. Wheeler*, No. 2:20-cv-602 (D.N.M.); *N.M. Cattle Growers'*  
 6 *Ass'n v. EPA*, No. 1:19-cv-988 (D.N.M.); *Murray v. Wheeler*, No. 1:19-cv-1498 (N.D.N.Y.); *Or.*  
 7 *Cattlemen's Ass'n v. EPA*, No. 3:19-cv-564 (D. Or.); *Puget Soundkeeper All. v. EPA*, No. 2:20-  
 8 cv-950 (W.D. Wash.); *Environmental Integrity Project v. Wheeler*, 1:20-cv-1734 (D.D.C.); *Wa.*  
 9 *Cattlemen's Ass'n v. EPA*, No. 2:19-cv-569 (W.D. Wash.).

10       11. Relief

11       Plaintiffs seek: (a) a declaratory judgment that, in promulgating the 2020 Rule, Defendants  
 12 acted arbitrarily, capriciously, contrary to law, and abused their discretion; (b) an order vacating  
 13 and setting aside the 2020 Rule; (c) an award of Plaintiffs' reasonable fees, costs, expenses, and  
 14 disbursements, including attorneys' fees, under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. §  
 15 2412(d); and (d) such additional and further relief as the Court deems just, proper and necessary.

16       Defendants and State Intervenor-Defendants deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.

17       12. Settlement and ADR

18       The Parties have complied with ADR Local Rule 3-5 and have discussed the various ADR  
 19 options provided by this court and private entities. The Parties do not believe that ADR is  
 20 appropriate.

21       13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes

22       Defendants have declined to consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further  
 23 proceedings, including trial and entry of judgment.

24       14. Other References

25       The Parties do not believe that this case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration,  
 26 special master, or the Judicial Panel for Multidistrict Litigation.

27       15. Narrowing of Issues

28       The Parties do not believe that it is possible to narrow the issues.

1           16. Expedited Trial Procedure

2           The Parties anticipate that the case will be resolved on summary judgment. No trial is  
3 expected to occur.

4           17. Scheduling

5           The Parties agree that departure from the default deadlines set forth in Local Rule 16-5 is  
6 appropriate in this matter. The Parties request oral argument on their cross-motions for summary  
7 judgment.

8           A. The Parties' Proposed Schedule Regarding Production of All Documents in the  
9           Administrative Record for the 2020 Rule

10          The Parties discussed the production of the documents in the administrative record that  
11 Defendants assert are copyrighted and/or are physical files that are part of the administrative  
12 record but are not accessible on the docket for the 2020 Rule at regulations.gov and have not been  
13 produced, and were able to agree as follows:

<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Action</b>
September 15, 2020	Defendants will provide Plaintiffs and State Intervenors with a draft protective order regarding access to and use of the documents that are part of the administrative record but are not accessible on the docket for the 2020 Rule because Defendants contend they are copyrighted.
September 17, 2020	Defendants will provide Plaintiffs and State Intervenors with electronic or hard copies of the physical files that are part of the administrative record and are not subject to copyright but are in a file size/format that is not accessible on the docket.
September 22, 2020	If the Parties reach an agreement on the terms of a proposed protective order, Defendants will file the proposed protective order with the Court.
September 29, 2020	The Court, in its discretion, will sign the proposed protective order.
September 30, 2020	If a protective order is entered, Defendants will provide Plaintiffs, State Intervenors, and the Court with electronic access to all

	documents in the administrative record, including copyrighted documents.
--	--

3                   B. The Parties' Proposed Briefing Schedules for Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment

4                   The Parties were unable to reach an agreement on the briefing schedule for the cross-  
5 motions for summary judgment, but were able to agree on the page limits for each party's briefs.

6                   Plaintiffs' Proposed Briefing Schedule

7                   Assuming Defendants provide all Parties and the Court with electronic access by the  
8 deadlines set forth above to the entire administrative record, including all documents that  
9 Defendants assert are copyrighted and copies of all physical files in the administrative record that  
10 are in a file size/format that is not accessible on the docket of the 2020 Rule, Plaintiffs  
11 respectfully propose the following briefing schedule:

<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Action</u>
November 23, 2020	Plaintiffs shall file their motion for summary judgment along with a supporting memorandum which shall not exceed 45 pages of text.
January 22, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defendants shall file a combined opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and cross-motion for summary judgment not to exceed 45 pages of text.</li> <li>• State Intervenor-Defendants shall file an opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and cross-motion for summary judgment not to exceed 25 pages of text.</li> </ul>
February 17, 2021	All amicus briefs shall be filed. Amicus briefs shall not exceed 25 pages of text.
March 15, 2021	Plaintiffs shall file one combined brief consisting of their reply in support of summary judgment and their oppositions to Defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment and State Intervenor-Defendants' and any other defendant-intervenors' (if any) cross-motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs' combined reply/oppositions to the cross-motions for summary judgment shall not exceed 50 pages of text.

1 May 6, 2021	2 3 4 5 6 7	• Defendants shall file their reply in support of their cross-motion for summary judgment, which shall not exceed 35 pages of text. • State Intervenor-Defendants shall file their reply in support of their cross-motion for summary judgment, which shall not exceed 15 pages of text.
Earliest available date no sooner than 21 days after briefing on the cross-motions for summary judgment is completed		Hearing on cross-motions for summary judgment.

8 Defendants' Proposed Briefing Schedule

9 Defendants respectfully propose the following briefing schedule:

10 <u>Deadline</u>	11 <u>Action</u>
11 October 28, 2020	12 Plaintiffs shall file their motion for summary judgment along with a supporting memorandum which shall not exceed 45 pages of text.
12 December 21, 2020	13 • Defendants shall file a combined opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and cross-motion for summary judgment not to exceed 45 pages of text. 14 • State Intervenor-Defendants shall file an opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and cross-motion for summary judgment not to exceed 25 pages of text.
13 January 12, 2021	14 All amicus briefs shall be filed. Amicus briefs shall not exceed 25 pages of text.
14 February 12, 2021	15 Plaintiffs shall file one combined brief consisting of their reply in support of summary judgment and their oppositions to Defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment and State Intervenor-Defendants' and any other defendant-intervenors' (if any) cross-motion for summary judgment. 16 Plaintiffs' combined reply/oppositions to the cross-motions for summary judgment shall not exceed 50 pages of text.
15 March 31, 2021	17 • Defendants shall file their reply in support of their cross-motion for summary judgment, which shall not exceed 35 pages of text.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Intervenor-Defendants shall file their reply in support of their cross-motion for summary judgment, which shall not exceed 15 pages of text.</li> </ul>
Earliest available date no sooner than 21 days after briefing on the cross-motions for summary judgment is completed	Hearing on cross-motions for summary judgment.

*6      State Intervenors' Proposed Briefing Schedule*

7                The State Intervenors prefer the agencies' proposed briefing schedule but likely would  
 8 agree to a different schedule if the plaintiffs and agencies are able to reach an agreement at a later  
 9 date.

10                18. Trial

11                The Parties anticipate that this case will be resolved by summary judgment, so do not  
 12 anticipate a trial. The Parties expect that any summary judgment hearing that the Court schedules  
 13 will require approximately two hours.

14                19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

15                Civil Local Rule 3-15 does not apply to any government entity or its agencies, including  
 16 Plaintiffs, Defendants, and State Intervenor-Defendants.

17                20. Professional Conduct

18                All attorneys of record for the Parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional  
 19 Conduct for the Northern District of California.

20                21. Other

21                The Parties are not aware of any other matters that may facilitate the just, speedy, and  
 22 inexpensive resolution of this matter.

23                ///

24                ///

25                ///

26                ///

27                ///

28                //

1 Dated: September 10, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

2  
3 XAVIER BECERRA  
4 Attorney General of California  
5 SARAH E. MORRISON  
6 ERIC KATZ  
7 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
8 CATHERINE M. WIEMAN  
9 ROXANNE J. CARTER  
10 JESSICA BARCLAY- STROBEL  
11 BRYANT B. CANNON  
12 Deputy Attorneys General

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 /s/ *Tatiana K. Gaur*

\_\_\_\_\_  
TATIANA K. GAUR  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California, by  
and through Attorney General Xavier Becerra  
and California State Water Resources Control  
Board*

For the STATE OF NEW YORK  
LETITIA JAMES  
Attorney General of the State of New York  
Philip Bein (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Senior Counsel

/s/ *Timothy Hoffman*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy Hoffman (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Senior Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Bureau  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (716) 853-8465  
Fax: (716) 853-8579  
Email: Timothy.Hoffman@ag.ny.gov

For the State of Connecticut  
WILLIAM TONG  
Attorney General

/s/ *Matthew I. Levine*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Matthew I. Levine  
David H. Wrinn (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
165 Capitol Avenue  
P.O. Box 120  
Hartford, CT 06141-0120  
Telephone: (860) 808-5250  
Email: Matthew.Levine@ct.gov  
Email: David.Wrinn@ct.gov

1 For the State of Illinois  
2 KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General

3 /s/ Jason E. James  
4 Jason E. James (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
5 Matthew J. Dunn  
Chief, Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos  
Litigation Division  
6 Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Bureau  
7 69 West Washington, 18th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602  
8 Telephone: (312) 814-0660  
Email: jjames@atg.state.il.us

9

10

11

12 For the STATE OF MARYLAND  
13 Brian E. Frosh  
Attorney General of Maryland

14

15

16 /s/ Joshua M. Segal  
Joshua M. Segal (*application pro hac vice*  
*forthcoming*)  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
17 Office of the Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Telephone: (410) 576-6446  
Email: jsegal@oag.state.md.us

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

For the State of Maine  
AARON M. FREY  
Maine Attorney General

/s/ Jillian R. O'Brien  
Jillian R. O'Brien, Cal. SBN 251311  
Assistant Attorney General  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, Maine 04333-0006  
Telephone: (207) 626-8800  
Email: Jill.O'Brien@maine.gov

For the State of Michigan  
DANA NESSEL  
Attorney General of Michigan

/s/ Daniel P. Bock

Daniel P. Bock (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Michigan Department of Attorney General  
Environment, Natural Resources and  
Agriculture Division  
P.O. Box 30755  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Telephone: (517) 335-7664  
Email: bockd@michigan.gov

1 For the State of New Jersey  
2 GURBIR S. GREWAL  
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Lisa Morelli  
5 Lisa Morelli, Cal. SBN 137092  
6 Deputy Attorney General  
7 Environmental Practice Group  
8 Division of Law  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625  
Telephone: (609)376-2745  
Email: Lisa.Morrelli@law.njoag.gov

For the State of New Mexico  
HECTOR BALDERAS  
Attorney General of New Mexico

/s/ William Grantham  
William Grantham (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
201 Third Street NW, Suite 300  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102  
Telephone: (505) 717-3520  
Email: wgrantham@nmag.gov

11 For the State of North Carolina ex rel. Attorney  
12 General Joshua H. Stein and for the North  
13 Carolina Department of Environmental Quality  
14 JOSHUA H. STEIN  
15 Attorney General  
Daniel S. Hirschman  
Senior Deputy Attorney General

16 /s/ Amy L. Bircher  
17 Amy L. Bircher (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Special Deputy Attorney General  
Marc Bernstein  
18 Special Deputy Attorney General  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 629  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
Telephone: (919) 716-6400  
Email: abircher@ncdoj.gov

For the State of Oregon  
Ellen F. Rosenblum  
Attorney General of the State of Oregon

/s/ Paul Garrahan  
Paul Garrahan (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Attorney-in-Charge, Natural Resources  
Section  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court St. NE  
Salem, OR 97301-4096  
Telephone: (503) 947-4593  
Fax: (503) 378-3784  
Email: paul.garrahan@doj.state.or.us

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 For the State of Rhode Island  
2 PETER F. NERONHA  
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Alison B. Hoffman  
5 Alison B. Hoffman (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
6 Special Assistant Attorney General  
7 Office of the Attorney General  
8 150 South Main Street  
9 Providence, RI 02903  
10 Telephone: (401) 274-4400  
11 Email: AHoffman@riag.ri.gov

12 For the State of Washington  
13 ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
14 Attorney General

15 /s/ Ronald L. Lavigne  
16 Ronald L. Lavigne (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
17 Senior Counsel  
18 Office of the Attorney General  
19 2425 Bristol Court SW, 2nd Fl.  
20 Olympia, WA 98504  
21 Telephone: (305) 586-6751  
22 Email: ronald.lavigne@atg.wa.gov

23 For the State of Vermont  
24 THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
25 Attorney General of Vermont

26 /s/ Laura B. Murphy  
27 Laura B. Murphy (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
28 Assistant Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
Telephone: (802) 828-3186  
Email: laura.murphy@vermont.gov

1 For the State of Wisconsin  
2 JOSHUA L. KAUL  
3 Wisconsin Attorney General

4 /s/ Gabe Johnson-Karp  
5 Gabe Johnson-Karp (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
6 Assistant Attorney General  
7 Wisconsin Department of Justice  
8 P.O. Box 7857  
9 Madison, WI 53707  
10 Telephone: (608) 267-8904  
11 Email: johnsonkarpg@doj.state.wi.us

1 For the Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
2 MAURA HEALEY  
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Seth Schofield  
5 Seth Schofield (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
6 Senior Appellate Counsel  
7 David S. Frankel (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
8 Special Assistant Attorney General  
9 Energy and Environment Bureau  
10 Office of the Attorney General  
11 One Ashburton Place, 18th Flr.  
12 Boston, MA 02108  
13 Telephone: (617) 963-2436 / 2294  
14 Email: seth.schofield@mass.gov  
15 Email: david.frankel@mass.gov

16 For the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
17 KARL A. RACINE  
18 Attorney General

19 /s/ Brian Caldwell  
20 Brian Caldwell (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
21 Assistant Attorney General  
22 Social Justice Section  
23 Office of the Attorney General  
24 for the District of Columbia  
25 441 Fourth Street N.W., Ste # 600-S  
26 Washington, D.C. 20001  
27 Telephone: (202) 727-6211  
28 Telephone: (202) 445-1952 (m)  
Email: brian.caldwell@dc.gov

For the Commonwealth of Virginia  
MARK R. HERRING  
Attorney General  
Donald D. Anderson  
Deputy Attorney General  
Paul Kugelman, Jr.  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Chief, Environmental Section

/s/ David C. Grandis  
David C. Grandis (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
202 North Ninth Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
Telephone: (804) 225-2741  
Email: dgrandis@oag.state.va.us

For the CITY OF NEW YORK  
JAMES E. JOHNSON  
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York

/s/ Nathan Taylor  
Nathan Taylor (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street, Rm 6-144  
New York, NY 10007  
Telephone: (646) 940-0736 (m)  
Telephone: (212) 356-2315  
Email: NTaylor@law.nyc.gov

1                   /s/ Hubert T. Lee  
2                   HUBERT T. LEE (NY Bar No. 4992145)  
3                   PHILLIP R. DUPRÉ (DC Bar No. 1004746)  
4                   Trial Attorneys  
5                   Environmental Defense Section  
6                   U.S. Department of Justice  
7                   4 Constitution Square  
8                   150 M Street, NE Suite 4.1116  
9                   Washington, DC 20002  
10                  Hubert.lee@usdoj.gov  
11                  Phillip.r.dupre@usdoj.gov  
12                  Telephone (202) 514-1806 (Lee)  
13                  Telephone (202) 616-7501 (Dupré)  
14                  Facsimile (202) 514-8865

15                  *Attorneys for Defendants*

16                  CHRISTOPHER M. CARR  
17                  *Attorney General of Georgia*

18                  /s/ Andrew A. Pinson  
19                  Andrew A. Pinson  
20                  *Solicitor General*  
21                  Drew F. Waldbeser  
22                  *Assistant Solicitor General*  
23                  Office of the Attorney General  
24                  40 Capitol Square, S.W.  
25                  Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
26                  Tel: (404) 651-9453  
27                  Fax: (404) 656-2199  
28                  Email: apinson@law.ga.gov  
                     *Counsel for Intervenor State of Georgia*

LA2020300885